



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,718	07/03/2003	Aaron Bangor	1033-T00528	7596

60533 7590 06/11/2007
TOLER SCHAFFER, LLP
8500 BLUFFSTONE COVE
SUITE A201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/614,718	Applicant(s) BANGOR, AARON	
	Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-56 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This action is in response to the Amendment filed 3/26/2007. In the Amendment claims 1-56 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-54,56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eudora ("Eudora", "E-mail Attachments in Eudora: How to be a Super Sender").

As per claim 1, Eudora teaches a system for use in electronically transferring a file, the system comprising: graphical user interface (GUI) comprising: a first user-selectable button having associated text that includes a verbal of "attach" (Pages 2-3,

attach document), wherein in response to selection of said first user-selectable button a file is capable of being selected by a user without display of a user-selectable button having associated text that includes the word "browse"(Pages 2-3).

Claims 2-20 are rejected under similar rationale, as claim 1, since the claims are directed towards non-functional descriptive material and regardless of what the button actually reads the functionality of the button remains the same.

As per claim 21, Eudora teaches a GUI further comprising a second user-selectable button having associated text that includes an imperative for "attach" (Page 2, Attach Document).

Claims 22-23 are rejected under similar rationale, as claim 21, since the claims are directed towards non-functional descriptive material and regardless of what the button actually reads the functionality of the button remains the same.

As per claim 24, Eudora teaches a GUI wherein the first user-selectable button is to instantiate a GUI element to find at least one file to attach to a message (Page 2, dialog box).

As per claim 25, Eudora teaches a GUI wherein the GUI element comprises a dialog box (Page 2, dialog box).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 26, Eudora teaches a GUI wherein the first user selectable button is to initiate a file browser of an operating system (Page 3, Find document file dialog screen...).

As per claim 27, Eudora teaches a GUI comprising a first user selectable button having associated text therein that includes "Find File to Attach" (Page 2, Attach document), the first user-selectable button to initiate a file browser of an operating system (Page 2-3, dialog box); and a second user-selectable button having associated text therein that includes "Attach files", the second user-selectable button to initiate attaching one or more files found the file browser (Page 3, Attach button).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to that of claim 27 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 29-47 are rejected under similar rationale, as claim 27, since the claims are directed towards non-functional descriptive material and regardless of what the button actually reads the functionality of the button remains the same.

As per claim 48 Eudora teaches providing a second user-selectable button having associated text that includes an imperative for "attach", wherein said uploading is performed in response to a user selection of the second user-selectable button (Page 2-3, Attach document).

Claims 49-50 are rejected under similar rationale as claim 48, since the claims are directed towards non-functional descriptive material and regardless of what the button actually reads the functionality of the button remains the same.

As per claim 51, Eudora teaches a method wherein the GUI element comprises a dialog box (Page 2, dialog box).

As per claim 52, Eudora teaches a method wherein the GUI element comprises a file browser of an operating system (Page 2, Mac or PC).

As per claim 53, Eudora teaches a method wherein the text is included in a tag associated with the first user-selectable button (Page 2-3).

As per claim 54, Eudora teaches a method further comprising displaying the text in response to a mouse-over event associated with the first user-selectable button (Page 2-3, inherent tool tip).

Claim 56 is similar in scope to that of claim 27 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora ("Eudora", "E-mail Attachments in Eudora: How to be a Super Sender").

As per claim 55, Eudora fails to teach audibly displaying text. However OFFICIAL NOTICE is taken that audibly displaying text is notoriously well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching with the method of Eudora. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way to communicate text with those with visual impairments.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Office notes that the factual assertion set forth under Official Notice in the previous office action was not contested.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Application/Control Number: 10/614,718

Page 8

Art Unit: 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100